HOME SHARING

PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

STUDY

Regional Niagara Senior Citizens Department

and

Ontario Ministry of Housing
Housing Conservation Unit

November, 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
1.0	INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE.	1
2.0	QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.	2
	1. Sample Description.	2
	2. Target Groups	3
	3. Program Starting Dates.	3
	4. Number of Information Requests.	4
	5. Numbers of Registered Seekers and Providers	5
	6. Number of Matches	8
	7. Sex and Age Profiles of Clients	10
	8. Source of Program Awareness	17
	9. Staff: Promotional Work	21
	i) Staff Time and Promotional Activities	21
	ii) Promotional Activities Performed by Staff . . .	21
	10. Promotional Methods Used.	26
	11. Promotional Costs	34
	12. Evaluation of Promotional Methods	37
	13. Most Effective Forms of Promotion	39
	14. Least Effective Forms of Promotion.	46
	15. Future Plans for Promotion.	49
	16. Use of Professional Services.	52
	17. Best and Worst Months to Promote.	55
	18. Implications of Research and Concluding Statements.	57
3.0	APPENDICES	
	Appendix "A" - Home Sharing Questionnaire	60
	Appendix "B" - Home Sharing Agencies in Canada.	71

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The primary purpose of this study was to identify the full range of promotional activities that are currently being used by home sharing services in Ontario, and to determine the relative effectiveness of each. This first phase of the study took place during the summer of 1987 and was undertaken by a research assistant hired by the Senior Citizens Department of the Regional Municipality of Niagara. The Housing Conservation Unit of the Ministry of Housing acted in a consultative role and provided further assistance with the analysis component of the study. Phase Two subsequently involves the application of some of these promotional activities within the Regional Municipality by the Niagara Senior Citizens Department.

A variety of criteria were incorporated into the evaluative phase of promotional techniques - among them; cost, amount of staff time, long term impact, and subsequent numbers of inquiries. The respondents were also asked to give their subjective impressions of promotional successes and failures.

Twelve of the home sharing programs surveyed are within the bounds of Ontario; however, statistics from three additional programs from Quebec and Alberta are included. Some written information on these programs is supplied, but the Ontario home sharing programs are the primary elements of analysis.

Readers of this report are advised to refer to the Tables which follow the written material and provide more detail than given in the text.

2.0 QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. SAMPLE DESCRIPTION
(Question 1)

The co-ordinators (No.=9) and the assistants (No.=3) from twelve home sharing programs in Ontario responded to the questionnaire on home sharing promotional activities. The sample was composed of the following home sharing programs in Ontario:

1. York Housing Registry-York Community Services
2. East York-Flemingdon Housing Registry - Flemingdon Neighborhood Services
3. S.H.A.P.E.S. (Scarborough)
4. "SHARING" Metro Toronto
5. "Match and Share" Ottawa-Carleton
6. Brockville Home Share
7. London Housing Registry/Home Sharing Program
8. North Bay Home Share
9. Homesharing for Older Adults - Peterborough
10. Sault Ste. Marie Home Sharing Program
11. HOMESHARE - Waterloo Region
12. Niagara Regional Senior Citizens Department Home Share

Three programs external to Ontario also answered the questionnaires:

13. Society for Retired and Semi-Retired - Edmonton, Alberta
14. Project Co-existence - Catholic Services - Montreal, Quebec
15. Home Share - Logement Partage - Montreal, Quebec

2. TARGET GROUPS
(Question 2 - See Table 1)

The respondents isolated a number of target groups for their programs. The following seeker groups were mentioned: seniors, singles, single parents, students, and low-income persons. With reference to the provider's category: seniors and single parents were target groups.

More specifically and based on original program guidelines, the following home sharing programs primarily target senior adults; Ottawa-Carleton, Sault St. Marie, Peterborough, "SHARING", and Niagara (generally one person 55+). Waterloo and Brockville have a dual focus on seniors and single parents; generally one person falls into either category. Some programs make it their mandate to be open to anyone wanting to share accommodation and therefore have a more diffuse focus upon seniors, single parents, singles and students. Among the programs with this broader range of target groups; East York-Flemingdon, York, S.H.A.P.E.S., London, and North Bay.

3. PROGRAM STARTING DATES
(Question 3 - See Table 1)

Most of the homesharing programs are relatively new enterprises. Four programs had their beginnings in early 1987, and two programs were founded at the end of 1986. Another four programs opened their doors in the fall of 1985. Two other programs had their beginnings in late 1984 and late 1983. The Niagara program was the first to open its doors in 1980.

4. NUMBER OF INFORMATION REQUESTS
(Question 4 - See Table 1)

Not all of the respondents answered this question. Some groups reported that they do not record information requests. The number of requests over the last 12 months was sought (June 1986-June 1987). However, as 6 programs have been in existence for less than 12 months, estimates were given for inquiries from their program starting dates.

Of those who had statistics for the 12 month period, S.H.A.P.E.S. reported the most inquiries with 2604. York and East York-Flemingdon both reported over 1000 requests. Of the newer programs, London recorded the most with 451 inquiries.

In all, close to 8000 total inquiries were received by the twelve programs. Approximately 75 percent of these occurred in the Toronto area. One can assume that this finding is due to the comparatively larger population size and also the relatively longer program existence of most Toronto area agencies.

5. NUMBERS OF REGISTERED SEEKERS AND PROVIDERS
(Question 5 - See Table 1)

There were a total of 3125 registered seekers (11 programs) and 1325 registered providers (10 programs) in the 12 month period specified. In summing these numbers, it can be deduced that a total of 4450 people were interested in the home sharing concept and were registered at one of the program sites. These numbers refer to seekers and providers on a waiting list to be matched.

S.H.A.P.E.S. recorded the most registered clients with 1,300 seekers and 600 providers. In general, the Toronto home sharing services reported more seekers than providers; whereas, in other regions, the opposite was more often the reality. Ottawa-Carleton, Peterborough, Sault Ste. Marie, Waterloo and Niagara all had a higher ratio of providers compared to seekers. Perhaps the higher ratio of seekers in Toronto is a reflection of the particularly tight rental situation in Metro and its suburbs.

TABLE 1 PROGRAM STARTING DATES/NUMBERS OF INFORMATION REQUESTS AND CLIENTS REGISTERED

PROGRAM	AREA POPULATION (1985)*	DATE STARTED	# OF INFO. REQUESTS PAST 12 MOS.)	# OF CLIENTS REGISTERED		
				SEEKERS	PROVIDERS	TOTAL
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	133,856	Nov. '85	1,450	396	115	511
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	97,679	Oct. '85	well over 1000 (1500)	(1986) 714	(1986) 118	(1986) 832
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	461,957	Sept. '85	2,604	1,300	600	1,900
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO	2,154,537	Oct. '83	Apr.86-Mar.87 824	161	129	290
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON	599,688	Oct. '84	Recorded 617	52	125	177
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	20,760	Nov. '86	8 months 36	4	3	7
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/ HOME SHARING PROGRAM	276,000	Jan. '87	6 months 451	392	not answered	392
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE	50,437	Jan. '87	No stats.	not answered	not answered	not answered
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	61,330	Oct. '86	8 months 48	22	38	60
SAULT STE. MARIE HOMESHARING PROGRAM	81,718	Jan. '87	6 months 112	12	29	41
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	328,224	Feb. '87	5 months 90	10	15	25
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	369,312	'80	125	62	153	215
TOTALS FOR THOSE RESPONDING			7,857	3,125	1,325	4,450

* Source: Municipal Directory, 1987

TABLE 1 (Continued)

PROGRAM	AREA POPULATION (1985)*	DATE STARTED	# OF INFO. REQUESTS PAST 12 MOS.)	# OF CLIENTS REGISTERED		
				SEEKERS	PROVIDERS	TOTAL
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON ALTA.	600,000	May '83	243	10	26	36
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL	2,921,357	May '83	1,964	81	175	256
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL	58,000	Mar. '87	126	51	50	101

6. NUMBER OF MATCHES
(Questions 6,7,& 8 - See Table 2)

There were a total of 429 matches made during the twelve month period, June 1986 - June 1987. S.H.A.P.E.S. recorded the most matches of all programs - 206 in the twelve month period specified. Of the newer programs, London had the most matches - a total of 36. The respondent from London owes these sizeable numbers to the fact that they are connected to a housing registry, and therefore have an established access point to a potential pool of clients.

Close to 200 matches are currently still in effect, as of June 30th 1987, excluding two agencies that did not give frequencies.

Five of six programs, which have been in existence for more than 12 months, responded that 583 total matches have been made since program inception (Four Toronto based programs and Niagara program).

TABLE 2 NUMBER OF MATCHES: PAST 12 MONTHS/CURRENT/SINCE START

PROGRAM	# OF MATCHES PAST 12 MONTHS		CURRENT MATCHES		PROGRAM'S TOTAL MATCHES	
	Matches	Clients	Matches	Clients	Matches	Clients
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	41	110	21	unknown	54	160
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	(1986) 27	unknown	not answered	not answered	not answered	not answered
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	206		96	not answered	245	
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO	44	88	23	46	56	110
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON	29	not answered	28	not answered	99	over 300 (325)
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	0	0	0	0		
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/HOME SHARING PROGRAM	36	not answered	not answered	not answered		
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE	4	8	0	0		
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	1	2	1	2		
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	4	12	4	12		
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	0	0	0	0		
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	37		15	32	129	275
TOTAL	**429**		**188**		**583**	
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON ALTA.	10	21	unknown	unknown	50	112
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL	28	57	22	45	121	243
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL	8	19	7	17		

7. SEX AND AGE PROFILES OF CLIENTS
(Question 9 - See Tables 3,4, & 5)

Only five of the twelve home sharing groups completed Question 9. Of the five that answered, it was apparent that a broad range of clients were attracted to the programs. The seekers were particularly varied with reference to their age groupings. A fairly even distribution of individuals between the ages of 16 and 55+ sought home sharing services. Comparable numbers of female and male seekers were registered (F=160, M=169).

The providers revealed a more skewed pattern of client ages. Perhaps not surprisingly, providers tended to be older, mostly in the 55+ category; much fewer were found in younger cohorts. More females, in comparison to males, were registered as providers (F=181, M=71). At a further level of analysis, it is not known whether these individuals had families living with them or if they lived alone. Furthermore, it is not known if similar trends occurred with the other programs.

Of the programs that responded and that had a singular focus on seniors - Peterborough, Niagara, and Sault Ste. Marie - the two former programs attracted most of their seekers from the 55+ category; whereas, the latter actually had more seekers in the 25 - 34 age grouping. However, in terms of providers, all three programs had a large majority of clients in the 55+ category. It is the usual circumstance that at least one client in a match is 55+.

Those programs with a dual focus on seniors and singles - Waterloo, and Brockville - had a diversity of clients in all age groupings. However, the small numbers supplied by these programs do not provide definite trends in terms of client groups served. Similarly, London, with a broader spectrum of clientele, had a full range of younger and older persons; however, few seekers were 55+, and statistics on provider profiles were not given.

TABLE 3 NUMBERS BY AGE CATEGORY: SEEKERS

PROGRAM	16 - 24		25 - 34		35 - 54		55 +		TOTAL	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY										
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY										
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)										
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO										
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA-CARLETON										
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	0	0	0	4	1	0	1	0	2	4
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/ HOME SHARING PROGRAM	48 (Apr.-June 1987)	39	42	20	27	21	6	1	123	81
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE										
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	0	1	1	1	1	4	4	10	6	16
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	1	2	9	6	1	2	2	4	13	14
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	0	3	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	7
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CIT.'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	1	2	1	2	2	14	20	20	24	38
TOTAL OF THOSE RESPONDING	50	47	53	34	32	43	34	36	169	160

TABLE 3 (CONTINUED)

PROGRAM	16 - 24		25 - 34		35 - 54		55 +		TOTAL	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED AND SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON, ALBERTA	0	1	0	2	0	6	2	4	2	13
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL, QUEBEC	2	2	7	9	4	13	17	27	30	51
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL, QUEBEC	0	0	8	16	7	7	6	7	21	30

TABLE 4 NUMBERS BY AGE CATEGORY: PROVIDERS

PROGRAM	16 - 24		25 - 34		35 - 54		55 +		TOTAL	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY										
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY										
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)										
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO										
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA-CARLETON										
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	0	5
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/ HOME SHARING PROGRAM										
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE										
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	0	0	0	3	2	4	16	19	18	26
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	0	0	0	1	0	8	9	18	9	27
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	0	0	0	2	0	4	3	5	3	11
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CIT.'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	0	0	1	7	3	6	37	99	41	112
TOTAL OF THOSE RESPONDING	0	0	1	14	5	23	65	144	71	181

TABLE 4 (CONTINUED)

PROGRAM	16 - 24		25 - 34		35 - 54		55 +		TOTAL	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED AND SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON, ALBERTA	0	0	0	0	0	16	5	24	5	40
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL, QUEBEC	0	2	1	10	5	32	18	107	24	151
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL, QUEBEC	0	0	4	12	6	14	6	8	16	34

TABLE 5 NUMBERS BY AGE CATEGORY: TOTALS (SEEKERS & PROVIDERS)

PROGRAM	16 - 24		25 - 34		35 - 54		55 +		TOTAL	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY										
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY										
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)										
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO										
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA-CARLETON										
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	0	0	0	5	1	1	1	3	2	9
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/ HOME SHARING PROGRAM	48	39	42	20	27	21	6	1	123	81
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE										
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	0	1	1	4	3	8	20	29	24	42
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	1	2	9	7	1	10	11	22	22	41
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	0	3	0	3	0	6	4	6	4	18
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CIT.'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	1	2	2	9	5	20	57	119	65	150
TOTAL OF THOSE RESPONDING	**50**	**49**	**54**	**48**	**37**	**66**	**99**	**180**	**240**	**341**

TABLE 5 (CONTINUED)

PROGRAM	16 - 24		25 - 34		35 - 54		55 +		TOTAL	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED AND SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON, ALBERTA	0	1	0	2	0	22	7	28	7	53
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL, QUEBEC	2	4	8	19	9	45	35	134	54	202
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL, QUEBEC	0	0	12	28	13	21	12	15	37	64

8. SOURCE OF PROGRAM AWARENESS
(Question 10 - See Table 6)

Eight of twelve programs responded to Question 10. Several of these programs only provided estimates because their records did not currently hold this information. Other groups did not give information pertaining to the categories specified in the questionnaire.

According to these estimates, registered clients became aware of home sharing services through the following sources (in descending order);

Other sources* (1081),
Municipal Welfare Office (562).
Family/friends (541).
Newspapers (315),
Other housing Service (302),
Radio/TV (213)
Voluntary agency (211),
Other housing registry (162),
Internal/drop-ins (82),
Brochures/newsletters (55),
Presentations (5)

*other sources include the following; former clients, educational facility, other government agency, political representatives, health care agency, hostels, schools, probation office, recreational organization, and self-referral.

The responses to this question are of course vital in developing an understanding of the connection, if any, between promotional activities and actual source of program awareness. One can ascertain from these findings that it is important to analyze the composition of the 'other sources' category. A large portion of client awareness is captured in this category, and should therefore not be left under one indescript heading. This

categcry reveals the diversity of sources of awareness, some of them rather unexpected.

In addition, the importance of family/friends and former clients in providing informal referrals can be seen in these statistics. Perhaps family and friends learned about the program from other sources, promotional and otherwise. It is apparent that promotional activities should be looked at in terms of their indirect effects (interaction between formal and informal means of information transfer) and also their long-term effects, not captured in this data due to the cross-sectional nature of this study.

TABLE 6 SOURCE OF PROGRAM AWARENESS

PROGRAM	OTHER HOUSING REGISTRY	OTHER HOUSING SERVICE	MUNICIPAL WELFARE OFFICE	VOLUNTARY AGENCY	RADIO/T.V.
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	42 (14.0%)	13 (4.3%)	73 (24.6%)	24 (8.0%)	7 (2.3%)
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	32 (13.9%)	17 (7.4%)	22 (9.6%)	40 (17.4%)	0 0
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	87 (4.7%)	87 (4.7%)	95 (5.1%)	124 (6.6%)	3 (.16%)
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO					
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON					
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/HOME SHARING PROGRAM	0 0	184 (20.0%)	368 (40.0%)	0 0	184 (20.0%)
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE					
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	0 0	0 0	0 0	15 (25.0%)	8 (13.0%)
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	4 (6.0%)	5 (8.0%)	10 (16.0%)
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	0 0	0 0	0 0	3 (12.5%)	1 (4.2%)
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN'S DEPT. HOME SHARE					
TOTAL OF THOSE RESPONDING	162	302	562	211	213
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON ALTA.					
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL	(10.0%)	(15.0%)	(2.0%)	(20.0%)	
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL	(1.0%)				

TABLE 6 (Continued)

PROGRAM	NEWSPAPERS	BROCHURES/ NEWSLTR.	PRESENTA-TION	INTERNAL DROP-INS	FAMILY/ FRIENDS	OTHER SOURCES
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	2 (.6%)	12 (4.0%)	4 (1.3%)	44 (15.25%)	42 (14.0%)	33 (11.4%)
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	4 (1.7%)	20 (8.7%)	0 0	19 (8.0%)	27 (11.7%)	48 (20.9%)
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	163 (8.7%)	8 (.42%)	0 0	19 (1.01%)	358 (19.2%)	922 (49.4%)
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO						
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON						
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	4 (58.0%)	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 (15.0%)	2 (29.0%)
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/HOME SHARING PROGRAM	92 (10.0%)	0 0	0 0	0 0	92 (10.0%)	0 0
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE						
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	17 (28.0%)	3 (5.0%)	0 0	0 0	11 (18.0%)	5 (8.0%)
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	25 (37.0%)	0 0	1 (1.0%)	0 0	7 (11.0%)	12 (19.0%)
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	8 (33.3%)	0 0	0 0	0 0	3 (12.5%)	9 (37.8%)
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN'S DEPT. HOME SHARE						
TOTAL OF THOSE RESPONDING	315	43	5	82	541	1,031
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON ALTA.						
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL	(5.0%)	(5.0%)	(3.0%)	(2.0%)	(4.0%)	(34.0%)
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL	(90.0%)				(9.0%)	

9. STAFF: PROMOTIONAL WORK

i) Staff time and Promotional Activities (Questions 11 & 12 - See Table 7)

All twelve programs responded to this question. There were eight co-ordinators working full time, four co-ordinators and seven assistants working part time, twenty-three volunteers and six students in all. All twelve respondents indicated that a main portion of the promotional work was done by part time staff. However, it is important to keep in mind that five of the programs did not have full time staff at all - as mentioned above, the co-ordinators are part time employees in these instances. In cases where there were full time staff, as well as part time staff, volunteers, and/or students, the promotional responsibility was delegated to them all. In some programs, these latter groups devoted more of their time than full time staff.

A couple of programs had their own solutions for promotions; Ottawa-Carleton hired one part time staff person to have full responsibility for promoting the program. Waterloo had a marketing student on placement spend all of his/her time working on a marketing/promotional plan.

ii) Promotional activities performed by staff (Question 13 - See Table 8)

There was a great deal of variation in the responses to Question 13 referring to promotional activities best undertaken by the various types of staff. In general, full time staff and part time staff were considered best for making presentations and doing interviews, newspaper articles and ads. It was thought that volunteers and students were more suitable for distributing flyers, posters, and brochures and for attending mall displays.

TABLE 7 STAFF TIME: PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

PROGRAM	Full-Time	Part-Time	Volunteers	Students	% Time Spent Promoting			
					Full-Time	Part-Time	Volunteers	Students
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	1		2	1	5%		50%	50%
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	1				10%			
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	1		5	1	1%		1%	
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO		2	12					
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA-CARLETON	1	1		1	1%	99%		1%
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE		1				65%		
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/ HOME SHARING PROGRAM	1	1			10%			
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE		1				10%		
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH		1				33%		
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	1	1	4		60%	20%	5%	
HOMESHARE WATERLOO	1	1		1	10%	25%		100%
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	1	3		2		10%		
TOTALS	8	12	23	6				

TABLE 7 (Continued)

PROGRAM	Full-Time	Part-Time	Volunteers	Students	% Time Spent Promoting			
					Full-Time	Part-Time	Volunteers	Students
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON, ALBERTA	Housing Registry Staff 2	0			13%	NOW 0		
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL, QUEBEC		1	1	2		10%		
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL, QUEBEC		2				5%		

TABLE 8 PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES PERFORMED BY STAFF

PROGRAM	FULL TIME	PART TIME	VOLUNTEERS	STUDENTS
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	Public Speaking Writing Newspaper Articles		Making Flyers Poster Distribution, Phone Networking	Casework for Matches, Presentations, Statistics
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	Outreach to Agencies, Workers & Volunteers		Flyer Distribution	Flyer Distribution
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	Classified Advertising			
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO		Media and Paid Ads	Speaking Engagements and Information Tables	
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON		Vast Variety of Activities All promotional activity handled by Community Awareness Officer	Could Work on Mall Displays or Flyer Distribution	Could Work on Mall Displays and Flyer Distribution
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE		Public Speaking & Agency Visits		
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/HOME SHARING PROGRAM	Public Service Ads, Brochure Mailing, Cable T.V. Contacts			
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE		T.V. & Radio Interviews	Word of Mouth	Information Table Radio & T.V. Ads No Interviews

TABLE 8 PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES PERFORMED BY STAFF

PROGRAM	FULL TIME	PART TIME	VOLUNTEERS	STUDENTS
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH		Agency & Media Information Session	Seniors to Man Information Displays	Brochure Distri- No Interviews
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	Radio-T.V. Interviews, Newspaper Releases/Interviews, Agency and Inservice Seminars	Cable T.V. Messages, Occasional Press Releases	Poster & Brochure Delivery Word of Mouth	
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	Media Interviews Presentations to Groups & Agencies	Mailout of Information to Agencies, Media & Applicants		Marketing Student Researched & Developed Marketing Plan
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN'S DEPT. HOME SHARE		Presentations & Making Ads for Newspapers	Promotion at Intake, Work at Mall Displays	Making Posters, Help with Information Sessions
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON ALTA.	In the Past - Radio & T.V. Interviews, Newspaper stories, Ads & Presentations			
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL		Newspaper Stories, Ads, Radio & T.V.		
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL		Interviews and General Information given on site		

10. PROMOTIONAL METHODS USED
(Question 14 - See Table 9)

Newspapers: Classified ads. and human interest stories were used the most. Other ideas: articles in feature columns/community announcements in local papers (Ottawa-Carleton, Waterloo); community, ethnic and seniors' papers (Ottawa-Carleton); one program reported good response to photos used in personal ads (Montreal Co-existence)

Posters: Posters were most frequently placed in libraries. Malls, grocery stores, hospitals/clinics, and doctors' offices were less often used.

Brochures: Almost all the programs had distributed their brochures to agencies that could recommend the home sharing program to their clients. 9 of 12 groups distributed their brochures to other groups; Among them - property management firms, churches/synagogues, community centres, seniors centres, information centres, local MP's/MPP's, laundromats, local colleges/universities, Parents without partners, and local restaurants.

Radio: Public service announcements and Talk shows had been tried by 8 out of 12 groups. Paid ads were rarely used. Other ideas: CBC morning show to promote concept of home sharing (York); late afternoon public interest show - 10-20 minute interviews including home sharers if possible (Ottawa-Carleton); monthly press releases - CBC 'Good Morning North' show and local senior's program (Sault Ste. Marie).

Television: Public service ads (9/12 programs) and interviews were used most frequently (8/12 programs). Other ideas: Rolling message on cable (Peterborough, Niagara, and Sault Ste. Marie).

Public transit ads: The transit ad was the least used promotional

method. The high cost of this form of promotion creates a barrier for most home sharing services.
(Aside: Apparently in Philadelphia, a home sharing agency tried ads on benches and found it to be quite effective (by-laws may/may not permit in Canada)

Public Information Sessions: This promotional method, most frequently in the form of a community presentation, had been used by every program at one time or another. Mall displays and general meetings were also used.

Agency contacts: Most agency contacts were done either by mail or by phone as other forms of contact were too time consuming. However, one respondent felt that face-to-face contact was the best means of contact in comparison to these other methods, when time permitted. Other ideas: Regional mail outs of introductory packages to other interested agencies ie. meals-on-wheels (Waterloo), local MP's/MPP's office (Brockville); listings in directories available to newcomers in the area (Ottawa-Carleton); and establishing informal routes of networking with agency contacts whenever the opportunity arose (Montreal Co-existence).

Additional promotional ideas:

Presentation at factory about pre-retirement (Niagara)
A&P stores - free advertising on plastic grocery bags
- bumper stickers
- placemats in restaurants
- find a sponsor ie. Esposito and Hockey Players placement for teams
(Sault Ste. Marie)
McDonald's Tray liners (Ottawa-Carleton)

TABLE 9 PROMOTIONAL METHODS USED

PROGRAM	NEWSPAPERS				POSTERS					
	DISPLAY ADS	CLASS. ADS	HUMAN INTEREST	OTHER	MALLS	LIB-RARY	DR.'S OFFICE	GROC. STORES	HOSP. & CLINICS	OTHER
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY			X			X				X
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	X	X	X			X				
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)		X	X			X				
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO	X	X	X			X				X
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/HOME SHARING PROGRAM		X	X			X			X	
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE		X								
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH		X		X	X	X		X	X	
HOME SHARING SAULT STE. MARIE	X		X	X	X					X
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION		X	X	X		X				X
NIAGARA REGIONAL SEN. CIT.'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	X	X		X						
TOTALS	6	10	9	5	4	9	1	2	3	6
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDM. ALTA.		X	X							
PROJ. CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL		X	X						X	X
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL				X						

TABLE 9 (Continued)

PROGRAM	BROCHURES				RADIO			
	AGENCY	DR.'S OFFICE	STORES & MALLS	OTHER	PUBLIC SERVICE	PAID ADS	TALK SHOWS	OTHER
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY				X			X	
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	X			X				
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	X			X	X			
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO	X	X		X	X		X	
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON	X	X	X	X			X	
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	X	X	X	X	X		X	
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/HOME SHARING PROGRAM	X			X	X			
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE	X	X	X	X	X		X	
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	X		X		X		X	
HOME SHARING SAULT STE. MARIE	X		X	X	X		X	X
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION							X	
NIAGARA REGIONAL SEN. CIT.'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	X		X		X	X		
TOTALS	**10**	**4**	**6**	**9**	**8**	**1**	**8**	**1**
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDM. ALTA.	X	X		X	X			
PROJ. CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREALAL	X	X		X			X	
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL				X			X	X

TABLE 9 (Continued)

PROGRAM	TELEVISION				PUBLIC TRANSIT				
	PUBLIC SERVICE	PAID ADS	INTER-VIEWS	OTHER	IN BUS	OUT BUS	SHELTERS	BENCH	OTHER
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	X								
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY			X						
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	X								
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO	X		X						
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON			X		X				
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE									
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/HOME SHARING PROGRAM	X		X						
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE	X		X						
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	X		X	X					
HOME SHARING SAULT STE. MARIE	X		X	X			X		
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	X		X						
NIAGARA REGIONAL SEN. CIT.'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	X								
TOTALS	9	0	8	2	1	0	1	0	0
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDM. ALTA.	X								
PROJ. CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREALAL			X						
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL									

TABLE 9 (Continued)

PROGRAM	PUBLIC INFO. SESSIONS				AGENCY (PRIVATE)			
	COMM. PRESENT.	GEN. MEETINGS	MALL DISPLAY	OTHER	PHONE	MAIL	IN PERSON	OTHER
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	X	X			X	X		
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	X	X			X	X	X	
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	X	X	X		X			
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO	X							
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	X				X	X	X	
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/HOME SHARING PROGRAM	X							
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE	X	X	X		X	X	X	
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	X		X		X	X		
HOME SHARING SAULT STE. MARIE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	X			X				
NIAGARA REGIONAL SEN. CIT.'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	X	X	X	X		X		
TOTALS	12	7	6	4	8	8	4	1
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDM. ALTA.	X		X	X				
PROJ. CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREALAL	X							
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL								

TABLE 9 (Continued)

PROGRAM	AGENCY (NON-PROFIT)				AGENCY (GOVERNMENT)			
	PHONE	MAIL	IN PERSON	OTHER	PHONE	MAIL	IN PERSON	OTHER
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	X	X						
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	X		X		X		X	
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	X	X	X		X			
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO	X	X		X	X	X		
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	X	X	X		X		X	
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/HOME SHARING PROGRAM	X	X	X		X	X	X	
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE	X	X	X				X	
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	X		X		X		X	
HOME SHARING SAULT STE. MARIE	X	X	X		X			
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	X	X	X		X	X		
NIAGARA REGIONAL SEN. CIT.'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	X	X					X	
TOTALS	12	10	9	1	9	4	7	1
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDM. ALTA.	X	X	X	X		X		
PROJ. CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREALAL	X		X		X	X	X	X
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL	X		X					

TABLE 9 (Continued)

PROGRAM	OTHER FORMS OF PROMOTION
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO	
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON	Macdonald's tray liners
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/HOME SHARING PROGRAM	
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE	
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	Grocery Store Plastic Bags - free advertising; Bumper Stickers; Restaurant Placemats; Sponsors; Guest speakers
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	Hospital Social Work Dept., Seniors' Assoc., and Service Clubs, YW/YMCA Recreation Facilities
NIAGARA REGIONAL SEN. CIT.'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	Presentation at factory about pre-retirement
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDM. ALTA.	CAG Conference Poster Display
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL	
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL	

11. PROMOTIONAL COSTS
(Question 15 & 16 - See Table 10)

The programs had a range of .1% to 15% of total operating budgets spent on promotion, with an even distribution between these two points. The most expensive promotional methods were reported by Ottawa-Carleton for public transit ads (inside bus), at $4,500 (found it productive) and an in-stand display at $4,000. Newspaper ads, brochures, and flyers also entailed some monetary commitment. Ottawa-Carleton also had the highest annual promotional costs. Some programs relied on comparatively more sporadic funding for promotional work. For instance, S.H.A.P.E.S. had a one-time grant with which they made a booklet printed in seven different languages.

TABLE 10 PROMOTIONAL COSTS*

PROGRAM	ANNUAL PROMOTIONAL COSTS	% OF TOTAL OPERATING BUDGET	NWSPR. ADS.	RADIO ADS.	T.V.	POST-ERS	BRO-CHURE	PUBLIC TRANS. ADS.	PUBLIC INFO. SES-SIONS	OTHER
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	$1,000	5%								Flyers $600
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	Undetermined									
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	$100/month 1 grant $10,000	.3%	$1,200				$700		$30	
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO	$3-4,000	7-9%								
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON	$14,000 (approx.)		$1,000			Flyers $6-700		$4,500		$7,400
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	$650		$250			$100	$300			
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/ HOME SHARING PROGRAM	$500	2.5%					$500			
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE	$1,500 (approx.)	7.4%					$500			
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	$ 170	15%	$20				$150			
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	$ 300	1%	Free	Free	Free	$300				
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	$40-50	.1%								
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	$200	1.5%	$150				$50			

* Private agency, community agency. government agency - N/A re: costs

TABLE 10 (Continued)

PROGRAM	ANNUAL PROMOTIONAL COSTS	% OF TOTAL OPERATING BUDGET	NWSPR. ADS.	RADIO ADS.	T.V.	POST-ERS	BRO-CHURE	PUBLIC TRANS. ADS.	PUBLIC INFO. SES-SIONS	OTHER
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON ALTA.	$220		$20				$200			
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL	0									
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL	Financed through other government funded agency									

12. EVALUATION OF PROMOTIONAL METHODS:
(Question 17 - See Table 11)

The categories of promotional methods listed above were rated on a scale of 1-5 (where 1=Low, 3=Moderate, 5=High) using the following criteria:

1) cost
2) staff time
3) long term impact
4) resulted in most inquiries

The results below reflect the program averages for each category.

Newspapers:
1) Moderate cost
2) Low/moderate staff time
3) Moderate/high long term impact
4) Moderate/high inquiries

Brochures:
1) Moderate cost (variable depending upon form of brochure and professional assistance used)
2) Moderate/high staff time (in developing ideas)
3) Moderate/high impact
4) Moderate inquiries

Radio:
1) Low/moderate cost (often free)
2) Low/moderate staff time
3) Low/moderate long term impact
4) Low/moderate inquiries

Television:
1) Low cost (free cable ads)
2) Low/moderate staff time
3) Low/moderate impact
4) Low/moderate inquiries

Public transit ads:

1) High costs (Ottawa Community Awareness Officer estimated that each client costs $18 - calculated according to # of inquiries divided into total costs (of which they received 250 - thus far - for one stint)
2) Low/moderate staff time
3) Moderate impact
4) Moderate inquiries

Public Information sessions:

1) Low costs
2) Moderate/high staff time
3) Moderate impact
4) Low/moderate inquiries

Agency contacts:

1) Low cost
2) Moderate staff time
3) Moderate/high impact
4) Moderate inquiries

13. MOST EFFECTIVE FORMS OF PROMOTION
(Question 18)

This open-ended question yielded some relevant and useful anecdotal information. It is important to be conscious of the fact that different methods can be successful in one geographical area, but not in another. For example, for one home sharing program, cable TV was successful; but another program did not find it to be effective. Many variables can play a part in the success of any one promotional activity - quality of the product, location, broad focus/narrow focus in terms of targeting, "hit" time, length of exposure, particular form of promotion, legal context, etc.

These factors along with contextual factors are especially important to take into consideration when a program's effectiveness is being evaluated. Another example highlights this particular point. A public transit ad may be more cost-effective and reach a larger proportion of the population in Metro Toronto in comparison to Brockville. Hence, if a promotional method does not work in one location, one should not necessarily discount its use in another geographical area. A rule of thumb is that there are no absolutes with respect to promotional methods and their success.

Furthermore, it is difficult to have a full understanding of the linkage between promotional activity, actual source of awareness, and behaviour elicited, if any, following from this awareness. For instance, a human interest story in a newspaper may elicit a call from an interested party 7-8 months from publication date (as reported by Montreal Co-existence); or a public transit ad campaign finished in May can still produce inquiries two months later (as reported by Ottawa-Carleton). Another example reveals the complexities of promotional phenomena; a domino effect can occur when individuals at a public information session tell others of their experience and these individuals in turn contact a homesharing service. Ultimately then, the word-of-mouth method

was used, even though the public information session was the original source of information. This example reveals the usefulness of longitudinal research in this area to uncover the transfer of information through various points in a connecting loop.

It is vital to think of the long vs. short term value of promotional methods. Even though public information sessions may be ineffective in the number of short-term inquiries, one should take heed of the long term attitudinal changes which must occur if home sharing is to gain widespread acceptance. In the words of Gail Casey, co-ordinator of Montreal Co-existence;

> After four years, our experience has shown that people must fully understand what shared housing is all about before considering participating in this service. They must be sufficiently comfortable and familiar with the concept so that it occurs to them as an option when the need presents itself. Only public awareness campaigns, ie. educational promotions, will ensure that kind of understanding and familiarity. This is probably one of the reasons shared housing doesn't yet enjoy widespread acceptance. It is important to note however, that the work we are now doing as homesharing services, will see greater fruition probably only several years from now.

The long term impacts and inherent complexities must therefore be taken into account when planning home sharing promotional campaigns.

It is interesting to note, when looking back to 'source of program awareness', that the family/friends word-of-mouth category was not mentioned at all in the promotional activities section. These informal routes of contact could perhaps be explored more extensively in future work in this area (eg. 'SHARING' has hosted Open House Teas - open to the public).

Scale 1 - Low
3 - Moderate
5 - High

TABLE 11 EVALUATION OF PROMOTIONAL METHODS

PROGRAM	NEWSPAPERS				BROCHURES			
	COST	STAFF TIME	LONG-TERM IMPACT	MOST INQUIRIES	COST	STAFF TIME	LONG-TERM IMPACT	MOST INQUIRIES
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	5	1	4	3	4	3	4	2
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	5	1	3	1	4	3	5	5
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	4	1.5	5	5	3			
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO			4	4			4	4
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON	3	4.5	3.5	4	3	3	3	3
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	3	1	4	4	3	3	3	2
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/HOME SHARING PROGRAM		2	3	3		3	3	3
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	1	2	5	5	4	4	4	1
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	1	3	2	5	4	5	5	1
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	1	1	4	5				
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	2	2	1	4	1	3	3	3
AVERAGE RATING	**3**	**2.3**	**3.6**	**4**	**3.1**	**3.5**	**3.9**	**2.9**
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON ALTA.	1	3	1	5	3	3	3	3
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL	1	5	5	5	5	4	3	3
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL	1	1	5	5	1	1	3	3

Scale 1 - Low
3 - Moderate
5 - High

TABLE 11 (Continued)

PROGRAM	RADIO				TELEVISION			
	COST	STAFF TIME	LONG-TERM IMPACT	MOST INQUIRIES	COST	STAFF TIME	LONG-TERM IMPACT	MOST INQUIRIES
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	3	1	2	2	2	1	4	2
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY								
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	1	2	?	1	1	2	?	1
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO			1	4			1	3
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	2
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	3	1	3	3	4	1	3	
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/HOME SHARING PROGRAM		2	4	4		2	2	2
HOMESHARE NORTH BAY								
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	1	3	4	1	1	3	5	3
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	1	4	1	3	1	2	1	1
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	1	2	?	?	1	2	?	?
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	5	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
AVERAGE RATING	**2**	**2.1**	**2.0**	**2.3**	**1.3**	**1.8**	**2.4**	**1.9**
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON ALTA.	1	3	3	5	1	3	3	5
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL	1	3	3	3	1	2	2	4
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL	1	1	2	1				

Scale 1 - Low
3 - Moderate
5 - High

TABLE 11 (Continued)

PROGRAM	PUBLIC TRANSIT ADS.				PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSIONS			
	COST	STAFF TIME	LONG-TERM IMPACT	MOST INQUIRIES	COST	STAFF TIME	LONG-TERM IMPACT	MOST INQUIRIES
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY					3	5	3	5
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY					1	3	2	2
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	5				1	5	1	1
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO							1	2
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON	5	4	4	4	1	3	2	2
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE		1	2	?	1	3	3	2
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/HOME SHARING PROGRAM						1	1	1
HOMESHARE NORTH BAY								
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH						3	3	1
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	5	2	3	1	1	5	5	1
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION								
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN'S DEPT. HOME SHARE					2	4	4	4
AVERAGE RATING	5	2.3	3	2.5	1.4	3.5	2.5	2.1
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON ALTA.					1	4	5	5
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL					2	5	3	3
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL								

Scale 1 - Low
3 - Moderate
5 - High

TABLE 11 (Continued)

PROGRAM	AGENCY CONTACTS				OTHER FORMS OF PROMOTION			
	COST	STAFF TIME	LONG-TERM IMPACT	MOST INQUIRIES	COST	STAFF TIME	LONG-TERM IMPACT	MOST INQUIRIES
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	3	5	4	3				
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	1	3	5	5				
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	2	2	3	3	Booklets 1	5	?	
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO			4	4				
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON	1	2	3	3	Macdonald Tray Liners 1	1	not known yet	
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	1	4	4	3				
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/HOME SHARING PROGRAM	1	4	5	5				
HOMESHARE NORTH BAY								
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	1	4	3	3				
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	1	4	5	1				
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION								
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	1	2	4	3	Information Days (Seniors) 4	5	4	4
AVERAGE RATING	**1.3**	**3.3**	**4**	**3.4**				
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON ALTA.	1	3	5	5	Mall Displays 1	3	2	3
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL	1	4	3	5				
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL	1	1	3	1				

MOST EFFECTIVE FORMS OF PROMOTION: (cont'd)
(See Table 12)

The most effective methods have been ordered from most frequently mentioned to least frequently mentioned.

1) Newspapers (classified ads, feature articles, human interest stories, interviews)
2) Agency contacts
3) Brochures (at libraries)
4) Radio
5) Television (Roladex-cable TV)
6) Posters (at community agencies)
7) Transit ads
8) Word-of-mouth
9) Home sharing meetings
10) Information days
11) Distribution in employee pay cheques

10 out of 12 programs felt that newspapers were the most productive form of promotion. The classified ads for specific clients and the human interest stories both seemed to have the capacity for giving a more personal side to the program. Agency contacts also seem to result in a large number of inquiries. The various agencies refer clients who have been identified as having a need for alternative housing. The use of an effective brochure has also been imperative for program promotion - as they are in written form and they can be kept for reference purposes. It was noted that inquiries in the long term seem to be attributable to brochure distribution.

14. **LEAST EFFECTIVE FORMS OF PROMOTION**
(Question 19 - again from most to least mentioned)
(See Table 12)

1) Public information sessions (community presentations, public speaking engagements, mall displays - Problem: "too broadly targeted" says S.H.A.P.E.S.)

2) TV (cable TV, short community spots)

3) Agency contacts (conservative attitudes of some municipally funded agencies)

4) Transit ads (small transit system - Brockville)

5) Newspaper ads

6) Coupon mailing

Overall, the public speaking sessions and cable T.V. ads received the most negative commentary. Neither of these methods produced many inquiries.

Suzanne Hale, Community Awareness Officer from Ottawa-Carleton gave some useful suggestions for the successful development of presentation materials:

> In establishing an awareness program, it is helpful if there is some idea of who the "user" or "prospective user" might be, such that the advertising is aimed at that population and used in the appropriate place. eg. using transit ads in an area where public transit is one of the primary sources of transportation - or having a display and appearing at country fairs if that is a popular pass-time.

Rather than creating a promotional scheme covering a broad spectrum of individuals, some promotions may be more successful if key segments of the population are specifically targeted. Thus, a more focused methodology for promotions may give new life to previously ineffective promotions.

TABLE 12 MOST EFFECTIVE/LEAST EFFECTIVE FORMS OF PROMOTION

PROGRAM	MOST EFFECTIVE	LEAST EFFECTIVE
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	For seekers - Agency contacts Providers - T.V., Newspapers & Brochures	
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	Brochures & Agency contacts	Newspaper ads. and public speaking engagements
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	Definitely classified ads	Public information sessions Community presentations
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO	Newspaper ads., brochures (at libraries especially), brochures and posters at community agencies	Coupon mailing - (little response)
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON	Transit ads., but very expensive, Newspaper features, distribution in employee paycheques	Cable T.V. - time of day and type of program may explain small response
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	Newspapers, radio and Agency contacts	Television and transit ads.
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/ HOME SHARING PROGRAM	Agency contacts, brochures, radio, classified section of newspapers (attracts landlords)	Public information sessions, T.V.
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE	Newspaper interviews	
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	Newspaper articles, brochure distribution, Television	Speaking to groups doesn't result in direct referrals or calls
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	Newspapers - human interest stories cable ads. - ongoing & cost effective	Community gov't funded agencies - reserved attitude about program
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	Feature articles in newspapers, Agency contacts, word of mouth	Too early to tell
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	Home sharing meetings, community presentations, information days, classified ads.	Mall displays
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON ALTA.	Human interest stories, public speaking, newspapers and radio spots	Short community spots on television

TABLE 12 (Continued)

PROGRAM	MOST EFFECTIVE	LEAST EFFECTIVE
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL	Newspapers, radio and television	Brochures, Agency contacts, public information sessions
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL	Newspaper reports, brochures, public meetings	All seemed effective - difficult to evaluate long term impact.

15. FUTURE PLANS FOR PROMOTION
(Question 20 - See Table 13)

Other promotional ideas have been considered but, as of yet, not tried. Some of these ideas may provide some useful fuel for promotional development in upcoming years;

Display board with pouch for brochures

Booth/display at malls, fairs

Transit ads

Approaching churches

Contact landlords to find potential clients

Contact future retirees ie. companies

Promotion with larger chain stores and banks

Outdoor signs

Posters

Write-up in paper - profile of person in the program (either homesharing counsellor and/or client - indicates personal level of program)

"Open House Tea" - promotes community involvement

Cards left at colleges and universities - accommodation board, off-campus housing centre, etc.

1/2 hour T.V. show

Bookmarks

Several groups have considered public transit ads but due to the substantial costs involved they have not implemented this idea. One program is applying for community sponsorship from a service agency in order to dodge this cost barrier.

The need for improved posters and mall displays was also expressed, but once again the cost factor was a major hindrance for utilizing this promotional method to the fullest extent possible.

TABLE 13 FUTURE PLANS FOR PROMOTION

PROGRAM	IDEAS FOR PROMOTION
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	Public transit ad. - Mall display, 1/2 hr. T.V. show
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	Approaching each church in the area
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	Display board with pouch for brochures
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO	Transit ads., bookmarks (in progress), contacting future retirees
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON	Contact landlords - participate in cooperative searches, promotional activities with larger chain stores and banks
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/HOME SHARING PROGRAM	More posters, brochures, displays; public transit ads.
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE	Transit ads.
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	Use of outdoor signs, use a person in the program for a profile
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	Bus ads. - classified ads, cards at colleges and universities.
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	Booth display at malls, fairs; "Open House Tea", large posters; Transit ads.
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	New posters and brochures; More information meetings; paid radio ads
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON ALTA.	Posters and bus signs
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL	Public transit ads - must be in French - they serve English clients
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL	Information & promotional meetings with specific groups

16. USE OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
(Question 21-25 - See Table 14)

Ottawa-Carleton was the only program to use an outside professional marketing consultant to develop a total marketing package. Waterloo employed a student mastering in social services and tourism to develop a short and long term marketing plan.

In addition, the Sault Ste. Marie co-ordinator has a commerce background and the East-York Flemingdon co-ordinator has a marketing background.

Two groups had used professional services to design their logo, posters and brochures. Also, three groups have someone in their organization who has a graphic arts background.

In addition, 5 programs had used other professionals to help with promotional work. Both Ottawa-Carleton and Waterloo had used printers. Metro Toronto had consulted with advertisers. Niagara employed a radio station to produce an ad for them on the airwaves. They also had a student develop a slide presentation. Peterborough used a typesetting company's services for their program.

TABLE 14 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES USED

PROGRAM	Marketing		Graphic Artist		Other Professionals
	Outside	On Staff	Outside	On Staff	
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	No	No	No	No	No
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	No	No	No	No	No
SHARING METRO TORONTO	No	Student 1 term Yes	Design logo & posters Yes	No	Consulted with advertisers Yes
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON	Developed total promotion package Yes	No	Transit ads, Flyers, logo Yes	Graphic Section of Planning Dept. Yes	Print shop & photo lab at NFB Yes
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	No	No	No	No	No
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/ HOME SHARING PROGRAM	No	No	No	No	No
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE	No	No	No	No	No
HOMESHARING FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOROUGH	No	No	No	No	Typesetting Company
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	No	Co-ordinator - Commerce Back-ground Yes	Maybe in future for Mall display No	No	No
HOME SHARE WATERLOO REGION	Student Yes	Yes	No	No	Printers & verbal advice from various agencies Yes
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	No	No	No	Yes	Radio station did ad. Student designed slide presentation. Yes

TABLE 14 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES USED (cont'd)

PROGRAM	Marketing		Graphic Artist		Other Professionals
	Outside	On Staff	Outside	On Staff	
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON ALTA.	No	No	Brochure and logo Yes	No	No
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL	No	No	No	No	No
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTEMENT MONTREAL	No	No	No	No	No

17. BEST AND WORST MONTHS TO PROMOTE
(Question 26 & 27 - Table 15)

The responses to this question were particularly varied, and it is therefore difficult to establish a clear pattern. It is not an easy task to isolate the best/worst months due to funding/staffing fluctuations which can affect statistics. Again we must consider the different contextual factors for each location. In general though, the fall and spring months seemed to be somewhat better than the summer and winter months.

TABLE 15 BEST/WORST MONTHS TO PROMOTE

PROGRAM	BEST MONTHS	WORST MONTHS
YORK HOUSING REGISTRY	Winter - T.V./Radio Summer - Public Info. Sessions	
EAST YORK - FLEMINGDON HOUSING REGISTRY	Apr. - May Aug. - Sept.	Jan. - March
S.H.A.P.E.S. (SCARBOROUGH)	Nov. - Feb. especially December	April - August
"SHARING" METRO TORONTO	No Pattern	No Pattern
"MATCH AND SHARE" OTTAWA - CARLETON	Sept. - Oct., Dec. Jan., Feb.	April/May No real pattern
BROCKVILLE HOME SHARE	Summer & Fall	Winter months
LONDON HOUSING REGISTRY/HOME SHARING PROGRAM	Spring/Summer	Nov. - Jan.
NORTH BAY HOME SHARE		
HOMESHARE FOR OLDER ADULTS - PETERBOPOUGH	Winter for TV and speaking to groups	Perhaps summer
SAULT STE. MARIE HOME SHARING PROGRAM	Apr./May Sept./Oct./Nov.	December
HOMESHARE WATERLOO REGION	Fall/Spring	Summer/Winter
NIAGARA REGIONAL SENIOR CITIZEN'S DEPT. HOME SHARE	Sept./Oct.	Summer
SOCIETY FOR RETIRED & SEMI-RETIRED EDMONTON ALTA.	Sept./Oct.	May through July
PROJECT CO-EXISTENCE CATHOLIC SERVICES MONTREAL	Sept., Oct., Nov.	Dec., June, July
HOME SHARE - LOGEMENT PARTAGE MONTREAL	Sept. and May	Winter

18. IMPLICATIONS OF RESEARCH AND CONCLUDING STATEMENTS

Due to the small sample size and the complex nature of this area of study, one must be cautious in the interpretation of these findings. Promotional activity does not follow a simple A-B, stimulus-behaviour pattern. Further, reaction to any one promotion may not occur within any set time frame. As noted by some respondents, inquiries may be received several months from promotional initiation. To add to this complexity, it may be that 2-3 methods used together may be more effective than just using one alone. As discussed above, the many contextual factors involved create the potential for a great deal of fluctuation in the success of any particular method. One can see that an evaluation of these combinations of methods would be quite complicated. There is a need for longitudinal research in order to understand promotional impacts at different time periods.

The inclusion of the quote from the Montreal Co-existence program reveals the importance of having an orientation for the present as well as a vision for the future. In order for 'home sharing' to become a familiar term, we must endeavour to keep a balance of short term and long term goals in mind. Classified ads and posters may be effective in the short term, but more interactional, educational methods, such as community based presentations, may be indispensible in leaving a lasting impression on the general public. The value of home sharing on both individual and societal levels could be a focal point for future deliberation.

The use of standard statistical sheets, currently being developed by the Ministry of Housing, will ease the collection of data in future years. In this study many groups used slightly different time frames and categories in responding to the questionnaire. In addition, some home sharing groups are components of a package of services which made answering some of the more detailed questions somewhat tedious. Statistics, which will be collated on a monthly and/or quarterly basis for the Ministry, will be

helpful for future research requiring this information. In addition, a computer program, also in the development stages at the Ministry, will enable co-ordinators to prepare necessary data reports with less effort. A forthcoming manual on Home Sharing to be prepared by the Ministry will also provide a useful reference on operational procedures.

Waterloo, in their closing comments, suggested the need for a provincial homesharing association. This would enable the various home sharing groups; "to network between communities and promote the concept to the public at large." By sharing ideas, and possibly resources, the vast potential of the homesharing concept could be more fully realized. The necessity of filtering information down to a larger portion of the population is paramount. In essence, the necessity of affordable accommodation, in combination with attitudinal change, will be the 'mother of invention' in relation to further expansion of home sharing services.

The importance of targeting a prospective client group, and developing a promotion from this, has proven to be a useful approach. The respondent from Ottawa also stressed that advertising be placed in the appropriate place to gain the attention/awareness of this client group.

The employment of part time staff/students/volunteers can make a vast difference in the amount of time and money spent on promotion. The invaluable help of students during placements or summer employment was noted by some groups.

This survey has indicated some inexpensive yet effective promotional schemes - such as classified ads and human interest stories in newspapers. Agency contacts also proved to be quite effective, with the only cost being staff time, which unfortunately some groups do not have at present.

This survey will hopefully be useful in terms of providing some ideas for future promotions (for existing and new agencies alike). The past experience of other home sharing agencies, reported here, will be beneficial in this regard. Group work, possibly through a future home sharing association in Ontario, has the potential to be fruitful in terms of providing a forum for brainstorming promotional schemes/techniques.

Other avenues which could be explored more extensively include; ('loose' ideas at present which need further thought)

1) Family/friends - word-of-mouth - as they are key players in referring clients, how can more be reached and given relevant information to pass on?

2) Universities/colleges - In many regards the pairing of students and seniors may seem inappropriate at first. However, an able-bodied student with an eye for inexpensive rent may be a perfect match for a senior with diminishing health, possibly a need for companionship and a large, empty home. Especially promising for universities with gerontology, social work, health care specializations - as part of course work?

3) How to reach the elusive middle-aged female seeker category -they are in demand, but how can we find them? Future research could look into why there have been difficulties capturing this particular group of clients.

Another note: Edmonton group has received funding from Alberta Ministry of Municipal Affairs - housing division to do research into shared housing - these efforts will help to further develop and refine our understanding of home sharing.

3.0 APPENDICES:

APPENDIX "A"

HOME SHARING QUESTIONNAIRE

HOME SHARING QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to assist existing and new home sharing* services in Ontario to identify the full range of promotional activities that are currently in use and to determine the relative effectiveness of each. Agencies also placing clients into private self-contained accommodation are asked to focus on the home sharing component of their service only.

Please answer as many questions as possible based on your statistics for the 12 month period ending June 30, 1987.

I) BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. General

   a) Program Name _____

   b) Address _____

   _____

   c) Telephone number _____

   d) Contact person _____

   e) Geographic area covered by the program _____

   _____

   f) Population within the area _____

2. Target group(s) for the program:

   a) Seekers _____

   _____

   b) Providers _____

   _____

3. Date/Year program started _____

---

* Where two or more unrelated persons share in a family house or apartment, each with his or her own room and shared common areas such as the living room or kitchen.

II) CLIENT INFORMATION

4. Number of information requests over the last 12 months _____

5. Number of clients registered (i.e. home seekers and providers on waiting list to be matched)

   a) Seekers _____

   b) Providers _____

   c) Total _____

6. a) Number of matches made within last 12 months _____

   b) Total number of clients involved in matches _____

7. a) Number of matches made since program started (if greater than 12 months) _____

   b) Total number of clients involved in matches _____

8. a) Number of matches currently in effect _____

   b) Total number of clients involved in matches _____

9. Number of clients in the following categories over 12 month period:

	Age 16-24		Age 25-34		Age 35-54		Age 55+		Total	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Seekers										
Providers										
Total										

10. Number/percentage of registered clients by Source of Program Awareness (if possible)

SOURCE	No.	%
Other Housing Registry		
Other Housing Service		
Municipal Welfare Office		
Voluntary Agency		
Radio/TV		
Newspaper		
Brochure/Newsletter		
Presentation		
Internal/Drop-in		
Family/Friends		
Other (Specify)		

III) STAFFING

11. Average number of staff working on the program over the last 12 month period at any one time (please specify if any are seasonal staff)

Full-time _____
Part-time _____
Volunteers _____
Students _____

12. Approximate percentage of staff time spent on program promotion

By full-time staff _____%
By part-time staff _____%
By volunteers _____%
By students _____%

13. What types of promotion activities are best undertaken by which staff?

STAFF TYPE OF PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITY

Full-time staff _____

_____

_____

Part-time staff _____

_____

_____

Volunteers _____

_____

_____

Students _____

_____

_____

IV) PROMOTIONAL METHODS

14. Promotional methods used (Check as many as apply)

METHOD USED	CHECK	DETAILS (eg. number, duration, client group targeted)
a) Newspapers		
Display advertising	____	_____
Classified advertising	____	_____
Human interest stories	____	_____
Other (specify)	____	_____
	____	_____
	____	_____
	____	_____
b) Radio		
Public service adver.	____	_____
Paid advertising	____	_____
Talk shows	____	_____
Other (specify)	____	_____
	____	_____
	____	_____
	____	_____
c) Television		
Public service adver.	____	_____
Paid advertising	____	_____
Interviews	____	_____
Other (specify)	____	_____
	____	_____
	____	_____
	____	_____

d) Posters

Malls	____	_____
Libraries	____	_____
Doctors' offices	____	_____
Grocery stores	____	_____
Hospitals and Clinics	____	_____
Other	____	_____
	____	_____
	____	_____
	____	_____

e) Brochures (distribution)

Agencies	____	_____
Doctors' offices	____	_____
Stores and Malls	____	_____
Other (specify)	____	_____
	____	_____
	____	_____
	____	_____

f) Public Transit Advertising

Inside Bus	____	_____
Outside Bus	____	_____
Inside Bus Shelters	____	_____
On Benches	____	_____
Other	____	_____
	____	_____
	____	_____
	____	_____

g) Public Information Sessions

Community Presentations	____	_____
General Meetings	____	_____
Mall Displays	____	_____
Other (specify)	____	_____
	____	_____
	____	_____
	____	_____

h) Agency Contacts (Private)

By phone	____	_____
By mail	____	_____
In person	____	_____
Other (specify)	____	_____
	____	_____
	____	_____
	____	_____

i) **Agency Contacts (Community/Non-Profit)**

By phone
By mail
In person
Other (specify)

____ _____
____ _____
____ _____
____ _____
____ _____
____ _____

j) **Agency Contacts (Government)**

By phone
By mail
In person
Other (specify)

____ _____
____ _____
____ _____
____ _____
____ _____
____ _____

k) Other Promotions

____ _____
____ _____
____ _____
____ _____
____ _____
____ _____

15. Approximately how much and what percentage of your total operating budget is spent on promotion?

$_____

_____%

16. Approximate annual cost of each promotion (if possible)

a) Newspaper advertising $_____
b) Radio advertising $_____
c) Television $_____
d) Posters $_____
e) Brochures $_____
f) Public Transit Advertising $_____
g) Public Information Sessions $_____
h) Agency (Private) $_____
i) Agency (Community) $_____
j) Agency (Government) $_____
k) Other $_____
$_____
$_____
$_____

17. Evaluate the methods of promotion. Please assign a numerical ranking for each on a scale from 1 - 5, where 5 is HIGH, 3 is MODERATE and 1 is LOW.

	COST	STAFF TIME	LONG TERM IMPACT	RESULTED IN MOST INQUIRIES
NEWSPAPERS				
RADIO				
TELEVISION				
PUBLIC TRANSIT ADVERTISING				
PUBLIC INFO. SESSIONS				
AGENCY CONTACTS				
BROCHURES				
OTHER (specify)				

18. In your opinion, which promotional activities were the most effective? (Please identify at least THREE if possible)

Why?

19. In your opinion, which promotional activities were least effective? (Please identify at least THREE if possible)

_____

_____

_____

Why?_____

_____

20. a) Are there any other promotional activities which you have considered but not yet implemented? (Please list)_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

b) If YES, Why?_____

_____

21. a) Have you ever used a professional marketing consultant for promoting the program?

Yes _____ No _____

b) If yes, describe the services this person provided_____

_____

_____

22. Is there someone on your staff with a marketing background?

Yes _____ No _____

23. a) Have you ever used a professional graphic artist?

Yes _____ No _____

b) If yes, describe the services this person provided_____

_____

_____

24. Is there someone on your staff with a background in graphic arts or a similar field?

Yes _____ No _____

25. a) Do you use the services of any other professionals in the promotion of your program?

Yes _____ No _____

b) If yes, please specify:

_____

_____

_____

26. a) What months of the year appear to be best for promoting the home sharing program_____

_____

b) Why?_____

_____

27. a) What months appear to be worst_____

_____

b) Why?_____

_____

28. For agencies offering both shared and private accommodation only. Please identify any differences in the methods used to promote private vs. shared accommodation.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

29. General comments/suggestions

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

30. Questionnaire completed by

_____

31. Date completed _____

We wish to thank you for the time taken to complete this questionnaire. A copy of the final assessment will be forwarded to you when available.

APPENDIX "B"

HOME SHARING AGENCIES IN CANADA

Ontario Ministry of Housing
Housing Conservation Unit
February 21, 1989.

HOME SHARING AGENCIES IN ONTARIO

Toronto (Metro)

Ms. Charlotte Maher
East York-Flemingdon Housing Registry
Flemingdon Neighbourhood Services
55 Gateway Blvd.
North York, Ontario.
M3C 1B4
(416) 424-2008

(Co-funded by Ministry of Housing and Metro Toronto)

Ms. Cathy McCaughan, Coordinator
Ms. Pam Donnelly, Assistant Coordinator
Home Share Etobicoke
Etobicoke Social Development Council
Valleyfield Public School
35 Saskatoon Drive
Etobicoke, Ontario
M9P 2E8
(416) 249-7378

(Co-funded by Ministry of Housing and Metro Toronto)

Ms. Christine Chun, Coordinator
Mr. Edward Nixon, Assistant Coordinator
S.H.A.P.E.S. -
Scarborough Housing Assistance:
Placement and Education for Singles
959 Midland Avenue
Scarborough, Ontario
M1K 4G6
(416) 266-4594

(Co-funded by Ministry of Housing and Metro Toronto)

Mr. David Deluca
City of Toronto
Homesharing Program
City of Toronto
Housing Department
112 Elizabeth Street
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 1P5
(416) 392-7472 ext.1156

(Co-funded by Ministry of Housing and City of Toronto)

Mr. Bill Sinclair, Coordinator
York Housing Registry
York Community Services
605 Rogers Rd, 6th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M6M 1B9
(416) 653-5400

(Co-funded by Ministry of Housing and Metro Toronto)

Ms. Susan Nwosu
Home Sharing Program
North York Housing Connection
c/o COSTI-IIAS
North York Centre
33 Lamberton Blvd.
North York, Ontario
M3J 1G6
(416) 630-7840

(Co-funded by Ministry of Housing and Metro Toronto)

Mrs. Nina Herman, Executive Coordinator
Ms. Moira Bacon, Assistant Coordinator
SHARING
Metro Toronto Shared Accommodation
Service for Older People
339 Bloor St. West, Room 212
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1W8
(416) 591-1657

(Co-funded by Ministry of Housing and Metro Toronto)

<u>Ottawa-Carleton (Region of)</u>

Ms. Sharon Peebles, Coordinator
Mr. Dan Huneault, Housing Clerk
Match and Share -
Seniors' Home Sharing Program
222 Queen Street, 10th Floor
Ottawa, Ontario
K1P 5Z3
(613) 560-1366

(Co-funded by Ministry of Housing and Region of Ottawa-Carleton)

Ms. Denise Dion
Co-ordinator
Shared Housing
Ottawa YM-YWCA
180 Argyle Avenue
Ottawa, Ontario
K2P 1B7
(613) 237-1320

(Funded by the United Way)

London (City of)

Ms. Shelley Milos, Coordinator
London Housing Registry
London Urban Resource Centre
388 Dundas Street, 2nd Floor
London, Ontario
N6B 1V7
(519) 433-1791

(Co-funded by Ministry of Housing and City of London)

Niagara (Region of)

Mrs. Lola Salmon, Coordinator
Niagara Homeshare
90-A Church Street
St. Catharines, Ontario
L2R 3C8
(416) 687-7414 ext. 395

(Co-funded by Ministry of Housing Ministry of Community and Social Services and Region of Niagara)

North Bay (City of)

Ms. Erna Kervin, Coordinator
North Bay Home Share Program
c/o Emmanuel United Church
395 Lakeshore Drive
North Bay, Ontario
P1A 2C5
(705) 472-8132

(Co-funded by Ministry of Housing City of North Bay and Golden Age Centre, Inc.)

Peterborough (City of)

Mrs. Patty Murray-Mossor, Coordinator
Peterborough Homesharing Program
Family Counselling Service
318 Stewart Street
Peterborough, Ontario
K9J 3N1
(705) 742-4258

(Co-funded by Ministry of Housing and City of Peterborough)

Sudbury (Region of)

Nancy Monageon, Coordinator
Heather MacKenzie, Assistant Coordinator
Home Sharing Program
Regional Municipality of Sudbury
Bag 3700, Station "A"
Sudbury, Ontario
P3A 5W5
(705) 673-2171 ext. 214

(Co-funded by Ministry of Housing, Region of Sudbury, and Ministry of Community and Social Social Services)

Waterloo (Region of)

Ms. Lee Salmond, Coordinator
Ms. Andraya Hoppe, Assistant Coordinator
Ms. Carol Brethour Stephens, Community Outreach Worker
HOMESHARE - Waterloo Region
Social Planning Council
of Kitchener-Waterloo
10 Water Street North
Kitchener, Ontario
N2H 5A5
(519) 578-9894

(Co-funded by Ministry of Housing and Region of Waterloo)

Cambridge Site Office
507 King Street East
(519) 653-HOME

York (Region of)

Ruth Cooke - Housing Worker
Home Sharing Program
Regional Municipality of York
Community Services Department
Support Services for Seniors
446 Davis Drive, 2nd Floor
Newmarket, Ontario
L3Y 2P2
(416) 895-5166 ext. 64

(Co-funded by Ministry of Housing and Region of York)

HOME SHARING AGENCIES IN OTHER PARTS OF CANADA

Alberta

Ms. Carol Ip
The Society for the Retired and Semi-Retired
10004 - 105 Street, Main Floor
Edmonton, Alberta
T5J 1C5
(403) 423-5510

British Columbia

Ms. Elizabeth Burgess
The Vancouver Homesharers Society
2182 West 12th Avenue, Suite 105
Vancouver, British Columbia
V6K 2N4
(604) 733-2310

Ms. Elaine Shearer
Single Mothers Housing Network
Richmond Family Place
6560 Gilbert Road
Richmond, B.C.
V7C 3V4
(604) 268-8033

Nova Scotia

Mr. Colin Colette
Dartmouth S.H.A.R.E.
45 Ochterlony Street
Dartmouth, Nova Scotia
B2Y 4M8
(902) 465-5578

Quebec

Ms. Gail Casey
Project Co-existence
Catholic Community Services Inc.
1857 de Maisonneuve Blvd. West
Montreal, Quebec
H3H 1J9
(514) 937-5351

Ms. Doris Allard
Home Share - Logement Partage
Centre Local de Services
Communautaires (C.L.S.C.)
Plateau Mont-Royal
4689 Rue Papineau
Montreal, Quebec
H2H 1V4
(514) 521-7663

Ms. France Auclair
Centre for Reference and
Assistance on Cohabitation
C.L.S.C. Ahuntsic
1649 Fleuri Est
Montreal, Quebec
H2C 1S9
(514) 381-4221